

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-7, 9, and 10 are pending in this application. Attached hereto is a complete listing of all claims in the application, with their current status listed parenthetically. By this Response, no claims are amended, cancelled or withdrawn.

In the Response to Arguments section of the January 05, 2006 Final Office Action that addresses the Applicants October 19, 2005 Response, the Examiner states:

"The stable single frequency mentioned by the applicant is provided by the master clock oscillator (1001 in FIG. 10, note col. 8, lines 57-61), however, this is further provided to the programmable delays (1005). Dress further teaches wherein the at least one slot allocation unit is capable of different repetition frequencies (1005 coupled to 1003 then to 1004 providing 7 derivative pulses individually, the programmable delays receive stable single frequency clock and provide seven derivative pulses having different repetition frequencies controlled by the programmable delay, note col. 8, lines 61-col. 9, line 4). Therefore, Dress teaches all the limitations claimed."

Applicant submits that the Examiner is mistaken as to the characteristics of the communication technology taught in Dress, and that in fact, nothing in Dress is capable of providing, suggesting or teaching "different pulse repetition frequencies" as recited in Applicant's independent claims 1 and 6.

The Examiner relies on Dress' components 1003 and 1005, FIG. 10 and columns 8 through 9 for teaching "different pulse repetition frequencies." In FIG 10, (as supported at col. 8 line 61 through col. 9 line 9), the "single stable frequency" signal is forwarded to a number of programmable delays 1005. As is known in the art, sending a periodic signal through a number of programmable delays does not and cannot change the pulse repetition frequency of the any of the signals. Instead, a plurality of delayed versions of the signal are created, but this is not equivalent to changing the pulse repetition frequency of any of the signals.

This is because a periodic signal  $f(t)$  with a period  $T$  would become a periodic signal  $\hat{f}(t)$  but would maintain periodicity  $T$ . The relationship between  $f(t)$  and  $\hat{f}(t)$  being  $\hat{f}(t) = f(t - x_n)$  for any programmable delay 1005 describing the delay  $x_n$ . Dress teaches, the Examiner notes, and the Applicant agrees that the single stable clock frequency is provided to the programmable delays 1005. The “single stable frequency” provided to programmable delays 1005 simply results in a plurality of delayed versions of the “single stable frequency” being provided to derivative pulse generators 1003.

Dress teaches component 1003 as a “derivative pulse generator”. As is known in the art the derivative  $f'(t)$  or  $\frac{df(t)}{dt}$  of a periodic function  $f(t)$  having a period  $T$ , also has a period  $T$ . Therefore it follows that the output of a derivative pulse generator 1003 would have the same pulse repetition frequency as the input to the derivative pulse generator 1003, as the periodicity has not changed. Dress teaches, the Examiner notes, and the Applicant agrees that the single stable clock frequency is supplied to the programmable delay 1005, which in turn provides a plurality of “single stable frequency” signals to derivative pulse generator 1003. Modulators 1004 receive a plurality of signals, some of which are the derivatives of the original signal and have been shifted in phase, but not periodicity, as stated by Dress, who teaches that this combination “permits the relative phases of the 7 derivative pulses to be individually adjusted in the static sense” (col. 8, line 64-66).

Therefore, Dress fails to teach or suggest slot allocation units “capable of different repetition frequencies”. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Dress cannot anticipate independent claims 1 and 6 and respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection.

As claims 3-5, 7 and 9-10 depend from claims 1 and 6, respectively, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 3-5, 7 and 9-10 has been traversed by virtue of their dependency from claims 1 and 6.

**Conclusion**


Applicant believes that this Response has addressed all items in the Final Office Action and now places the application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 3-7 and 9-10 at an early date is solicited. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

April 3, 2006

---

Date



---

Peter R. Martinez  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 42,845

c/o PULSE-LINK, INC.  
1969 Kellogg Avenue  
Carlsbad, California 92008  
Telephone No.: (760) 607-0844